

SECRET

SUN STREAK Ops/Tng Objectives

January 1986 - January 1988

| <u>Operations</u> | <u>Training</u> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 900 sessions (4 sources) | 450 sessions (2 trainees) |
| * | * |
| * | * |
| * | * |
| * | * |
| ***** | ***** |
| * * | * * |
| * * | * * |
| * * | * * |
| * * | * * |
| <u>Utility Assessment</u> | <u>SI - SIII</u> |
| 80% (720) | 66% (300) |
| * * | * * |
| * * | * * |
| * * | * * |
| <u>Collection</u> | <u>SIV - SVI</u> |
| 20% (180) | 33% (150) |

SECRET

SECRET

TARGET CATEGORIES

RV Intelligence Utility Assessment

1. (S/SK/WNINTEL) Attached hereto are the target categories selected for examination by RV in support of the planned RV Intelligence Utility Assessment. They have been carefully chosen to represent a broad spectrum of intelligence problems. The intelligence function and production codes of the DIA Register of Intelligence Publications (RIP) have been used so that results from the RV assessment study will be readily understood by intelligence users. Intelligence indicators will be identified for each category as target packages are developed.
2. (S/SK/WNINTEL) Plans are to conduct 20 RV examinations (5 each per source) of each of the 36 selected categories from January 1986 to January 1988 (20 X 36 = 720 sessions). Care will be taken to maintain appropriate compartmentalization of information relative to actual sites to be RVed. These procedures will guarantee that sources are unburdened by preconceived notions of the sites as well as insure that the information reported by the sources is the product of RV and not more conventional analytic efforts.
3. (S/SK/WNINTEL) The RV Intelligence Utility Assessment is not an attempt to scientifically prove or disprove RV through the use of statistical methodology. It is, as stated earlier, an attempt to identify those categories of intelligence targets which would best be serviced by RV. Therefore, each of the 720 RV examinations will be rated for accuracy and overall intelligence value. The 0 to 3 point accuracy rating scale developed by SRI International for GRILL FLAME will be used in conjunction with a 0 to 3 point intelligence value rating:

Accuracy Scale

- 0 - Little correspondence
- 1 - Site contact with mixed results
- 2 - Good
- 3 - Excellent

HANDLE VIA SKEET CHANNELS ONLY

SPECIAL ACCESS REQUIRED

WARNING NOTICE: SENSITIVE
INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND
METHODS INVOLVED

CLASSIFIED BY: DIA/DT
DECLASSIFY ON: OADR

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

Value Scale

- 0 - No intelligence value
- 1 - Minimal intelligence value
- 2 - Moderate intelligence value
- 3 - High intelligence value

The reason for this dual rating is based on the experience of CENTER LANE. Many times a RV session will yield very "accurate" data, but that data will be of little "value" to the intelligence community. The RV Intelligence Utility Assessment will identify those categories of intelligence targets for which both accurate and valuable information can be provided.

~~SECRET~~

Next 11 Page(s) In Document Exempt

UNCLASSIFIED

OVERVIEW OF SRI-INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION METHODS

Judging on a Blind Basis

In this method, SRI selected an analyst not otherwise associated with the series of sites to be judged to quantitatively assess the degree of correspondence of a given transcript of the remote viewer's data concerning each site and the actual targets. The judge was given a transcript including a list of specific concepts (e.g., "red" or "shady") for each site and was instructed to compare each transcript to each site (i.e., 6 sites = 6 transcripts/concept lists = 36 assessments per concept). Each concept was rated on a scale of 0 to 10 with "0" implying no correspondence between the concept and the target site and "10" implying complete correspondence. Upon completion of the rating, the judge then computed the average rating score for all concepts in each transcript matched against each target, displaying his results in a matrix with target displayed as rows and transcripts displayed as columns. The transcripts were then ranked 1-6 indicating which transcript most closely matched the actual site. This technique, although apparently excellent with regard to demonstrating the presence or absence of a viable RV function, did not provide a uniform measure from transcript to transcript of the quality of RV functioning. It therefore became necessary to develop an objective method of evaluation.

0-to-7 Point Rating Scale

This system was applied "nonblind", post hoc to the evaluation of the transcripts by the blind-judging method. For no correspondence between the transcript and target site, 0 was assigned; for excellent correspondence, 7; and for intermediate correspondence an intermediate rating. Several methods of "targeting" the viewer were used, and an average of accuracy was obtained for each method. A comparison of the rating produced with this approach against the ratings produced by the blind-judging approach showed statistically significant positive correlation between the two techniques. This, combined with the finding that application of the 0-to-7 point scale to randomly matched transcripts and targets (blind-judging method) yielded chance results, established that application of the 0-to-7 point scale provided a reliable, objective measure of RV quality.

UNCLASSIFIED

0-to-3 Point Accuracy Rating Scale

The FY 1984 SRI Evaluation project further refined RV evaluation procedures by developing the 0-to-3 Point Accuracy Rating Scale. This was used to provide a "bottom-line" assessment of the accuracy/quality of individual elements in a transcript, or of the transcript as a whole. 0 was considered a "miss", progressing through some correspondence (1), good correspondence (2), and excellent correspondence (3). While this reduced the number of factors needed to determine a viewer's accuracy based on objective measures, it still did not meet the criteria for scientific standards.

Princeton Evaluation Procedure (PEP)

The PEP was based on comparing independently valid quantitatively-defined target information with similarly quantitatively-defined response information. The definition of a particular target site was contained in the yes/no answers to a set of questions (30) called descriptors. The only target information to be considered for analysis was completely contained in the yes/no answers. A binary number (30 bits for PEP) was constructed for the target and the response descriptor respectively. YES = binary "1" and NO = binary "0". The resulting two 30-bit binary numbers were then compared by a variety of mathematical techniques to form a score for the specific RV session. For a series of RV sessions, a quantitative assessment was made by comparing a given response (matched to its corresponding target site) against the scores computed by matching the response to all other targets used in the series. There were four basic problems with the PEP system:

Bit descriptors were not appropriate for the training environment.

PEP was not interfaced to a standard data base management system.

Cross-target scoring was not sensitive to intelligence requirements.

Cross-target scoring was not appropriate for a training environment.

This led to the the development of the SRI Evaluation Procedure.

UNCLASSIFIED

SRI Evaluation Procedure (SEP)

As in the PEP, the SRI Evaluation Procedure quantified the target material into binary numbers corresponding to yes/no answers to a set of descriptors. Descriptor lists and coding techniques were devised for each RV response for analysis. However, it modified the PEP by using two different types of analysis -- the target-pool-dependent analysis and the target-pool-independent analysis. The target-pool-dependent analysis measured the uniqueness of the target/response match compared with the remainder of the target pool. The target-pool-independent analysis measured the accuracy and reliability of a single RV response matched only against the target material used in the session. Both methods of analysis met the need for a system scientifically measuring RV ability and accuracy, but they did not address the real world of operational intelligence collection.

Intelligence Ratings

This system rates 6 descriptors ranging from major gestalt to particular site relevant information on a scale of 0 to 3, 0 representing little correspondence to the site and 3 representing excellent correspondence to the site. Unknown and non-applicable factors are also considered, but not scored. Information perceived by the viewer is then rated for overall intelligence utility, ranging from no utility to very useful, or in some instances, indeterminable at the time of analysis. This procedure has not been extensively applied because there have been relatively few operational taskings since its development.

The next milestone will be the development of a data base management system that will provide the following:

Storage of operational RV session evaluations.

Analytic information concerning RV effectiveness when targeted against a variety of intelligence collection tasks.

Identification of reliable RV sources for each collection requirement.

UNCLASSIFIED

DATABASE MANAGEMENT

RV Intelligence Utility Assessment

1. (S/SK/WNINTEL) The RV Intelligence Utility Assessment will be expected to provide us with data which can then be manipulated to provide information on:

a. Which categories of targets lend themselves best to remote viewing intelligence collection.

b. The accuracy of each RV source.

c. The accuracy, dependability, and saleability of the RV process in the intelligence collection arena.

2. (S/SK/WNINTEL) In order to properly assess the results of the RV Intelligence Utility Package, we must first establish a database which will track specific items of crucial interest. (See Fig. 1) These include, but are not limited to:

a. Intelligence Utility Function and Production codes: Target categories which have been selected for examination by remote viewing.

b. Specific sub category of tasking: Specific category of interest to the RV process: target location, specific details, presence/absence of person/thing at site, etc.

c. Job number and job numbers of related tasking: For filing, reporting, and data management purposes.

d. Source ID (number or code): Tracking the results of each source will not only indicate the personal abilities of each source, but will allow a diagnosis of that source's tendencies towards greater accuracy with differing target types.

e. Date and Time of session: Recent ELF studies indicate that there is a positive correlation between sunspot

HANDLE VIA SKEET CHANNELS ONLY

SPECIAL ACCESS REQUIRED

WARNING NOTICE: SENSITIVE
INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND
METHODS INVOLVED

CLASSIFIED BY: DIA/DT
DECLASSIFY ON: OADR

SECRET

activity and dependability of RV collected information. Positive prediction of best RV session times will allow for the most efficient planning of work schedules.

f. Session number within a tasked series: Since RV results are statistical in nature, more than one Source and more than one session is run against each task. This field will allow for more refined accuracy in analysis.

g. General and specific tasking: A short explanation of tasked activity.

h. List of information known at beginning of RV work: In order to allow an assessment of the necessary information requirements to be made of future tasking agencies.

i. List of information generated during RV session: A list of the main information items returned to the tasking agency.

e. Accuracy of results: An assessment of the accuracy of generated information, as made by the tasking agency.

Ref 2 g. Value of results: An assessment of the intelligence value of the generated information, as made by the tasking agency. Analysis of this factor will provide the only reliable means of predicting the efficiency and usefulness to future tasking agencies. It will be the only accurate vehicle for generating credibility in and saleability of our product.

3. (S/SK/WNINTEL) Once the data base has grown to sufficient proportion to have statistically analytic value, questions which are statistical in nature and data-oriented can be tasked and answered. An example of these questions is presented in Fig. 2, below.

SECRET

| <u>FIELD</u> | <u>COMMENTS</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>Tasking data:</u> | |
| <u>Function code:</u> PGT | (Targeting information) |
| <u>Prod. code</u> : 2630 | (Internat'l terrorism) |
| <u>Specific cat.:</u> Location | (Search problem) |
| <u>Job number</u> : 86-062 | |
| <u>Related jobs</u> : 86-078 | |
| | 86-112 |
| <u>Session data:</u> | |
| <u>Source ID</u> : 132 | (Encoded for security) |
| <u>Date</u> : 860312 | |
| <u>Time</u> : 1302 hrs | |
| <u>Sess. number</u> : 003 | |
| <u>Tasking/site data:</u> | |
| <u>General task</u> : | RV hostage situation |
| <u>Specific task:</u> | Hostage location EEI |
| | State of health |
| <u>Given</u> : | Hostage name |
| <u>by tasker</u> : | Hostage DOB |
| | Hostage photo |
| | Last known location |
| <u>Results</u> : | Alive as of 860312 |
| <u>from RV</u> : | Well-fed |
| | Desert town |
| | Radio station antenna to west |
| | Airport to east |
| <u>Evaluation of session:</u> | |
| <u>Accuracy</u> : 3 | (Assessment made by |
| <u>Value</u> : 2 | tasking agency) |

FIGURE 1. EXAMPLE OF DATABASE RECORD

SECRET

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

SECRET

SUN STREAK OPS/TNG OBJECTIVES

JANUARY 1986 - JANUARY 1988

OPERATIONS

900 SESSIONS (4 SOURCES)

*
*
*
*

*
*
*
*

UTILITY ASSESSMENT

80% (720)

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

COLLECTION

20% (180)

TRAINING

450 SESSIONS (2 TRAINEES)

*
*
*
*

*
*
*
*

SI - SIII

66% (300)

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

SIV - SVI

33% (150)

SECRET

SECRET

SUN STREAK OPERATION PLANNING

JANUARY 1986 - JANUARY 1988

GIVEN:

1. FOUR TRAINED SOURCES.
2. EACH SOURCE CAPABLE OF DOING FOUR SESSIONS PER WEEK WORKING A TWO WEEK ON/ONE WEEK OFF PATTERN.

CAPABILITY:

530 SESSIONS PER YEAR.
-15% FOR LEAVES, SICKNESS, AND PERSONAL APPOINTMENTS.
450 SESSIONS PER YEAR.

TWO YEAR PLAN: 900 SESSIONS

80% OF CAPABILITY DEVOTED TO UTILITY ASSESSMENT.
20% OF CAPABILITY FOR QRT AND RESPONSE TO
COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS.

SECRET